

*REMARKS*

The Office Action dated May 20, 2005 has been carefully considered. By way of this Amendment, claims 1, 12 and 19 have been amended. Claims 3 and 15 have been cancelled. Claims 22-24 have been added. Claims 1-2, 4-14, 16-24 are presented and remain in this application. Applicant respectfully requests for examination and reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Applicant appreciates removal of the prior rejections that were advanced based upon Applicant's previous amendments to the claims. However, new prior art rejections have been advanced primarily on the basis of a new reference, U.S. Patent No. 3,195,846 to Dahlhauser. The Patent Examiner has asserted that claims 1, 3, 4, 6-16 and 19 are anticipated by Dahlhauser and that Dahlhauser teaches all the limitations of these claims. Additionally, the Examiner has taken the position that the remaining claims are obvious over Dahlhauser alone or in view of Dahlhauser in view of Loew.

In response, Applicant has incorporated the subject matter of claim 3 into claim 1 and 15 into 12 (with a similar amendment to claim 19) by simply deleting the words "or substantially equal to" in the independent claims. As a result, the interior chamber must have a horizontal with less than the thickness of the vertical support. It is thus submitted that the independent claims of the patent application (and claims 3 and 15 as previously presented) patentably define over the Dahlhauser reference cited by the Patent Examiner.

Dahlhauser teaches the exact opposite of this limitation namely that "the spacing between this free edge 22 (a) of each hook member 22 and the rear face of the base plate 20 that is adapted to engage the front surface of the board 10 is **equal to or slightly greater** than the thickness of the board wherefore this free edge of the hook member is in turn adapted to flatly engage the rear surface of the board and accordingly provide required mounting support." Col. 2, lns. 59-66 (emphasis added). In contrast to the "equal or slightly greater" requirement of Dahlhauser, the claimed invention claims a width "less than the thickness of the vertical support". Thus, there can be no anticipation of claim 3 or 15 as previously presented or of any of the independent claims as amended herein.

Moreover, this limitation not only distinguishes the Dahlhauser reference, but also provides meaningful importance as it pertains to this invention. (See eg. patent application,


is that it allows the mounting bracket to positively clamp with a true interference or friction fit on the vertical support. Thus, the mounting bracket is not subject to inadvertent removal and is much more securely fastened on the vertical support. Even a very small difference in width of the chamber provides for very significant benefit which is not realized by the Dahlhauser reference. Based on the foregoing and particularly in view of the express teaching of Dahlhauser not to make the interior chamber equal to or slightly greater than the thickness of the board rather than less than, Applicant therefore requests that the rejections that have been advanced be withdrawn (Note that there is no motivation or teaching for modifying this very specific and express teaching of Dahlhauser in the prior art or as it relates to this particular type of a structure. In fact, modifying the curved hook structure of Dahlhauser where the minimum distance is at the entry point could prevent installation of the bracket..).

Additionally, Applicant has added claims 22-24 which even further patentably distinguish the Dahlhauser reference. Each of these claims recite that the first and second portions of the prongs are each planar, whereas in the Dahlhauser reference the hook member 22 is anything but planar but curved. Accordingly, removal of the rejections based on this reference is respectfully solicited.

#### *Conclusion*

The application is considered in good and proper form for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Andrew J. Heinisch, Reg. No. 43,666  
Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren P.C.  
483 N. Mulford Road, Suite 7  
Rockford, Illinois 61107  
(815) 484-1900 (telephone)  
(815) 484-1032 (facsimile)

Date: July 28, 2005